

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

This application now contains claims directed towards product and method of using the product. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Claims 10-12 and 14 are drawn to a benzy pyrimidine derivative of formula IA and I for fungicidal composition
- II. Claim 9 is drawn methods of protecting plants or materials comprising of the compound of formula (I)
- III. Claims 13 and 15 are drawn to a process of preparation of compound of formula (IA) and (I).

The inventions listed as Groups I, II and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Groups I-III lack unity because the shared common technical feature is not a contribution over the prior art. Since it is well known in the art, it cannot be considered a special technical feature. In the instant case, the shared common technical feature is the compounds, pyrimidine derivatives, represented by formula (I) and (IA).

Unity of invention links the various inventions together by sharing a common special technical feature in each invention. However, when the special technical feature is not a contribution over the prior art, the various inventions may be restricted from each other. In the instant case, unity of invention does not exist because the shared common technical feature is disclosed by Sard et al (J. Org. Chem. 2000, 65, 9261-9264, listed in ISR) which teaches the preparation of the compounds which reads on formula I and IA (page 9261 reaction (1), (2) page 9262 compounds 5, 6 and 8). Therefore, restriction between the composition and method claims is proper. See MPEP 1850 and 37 CFR 1.475.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

#### *Species Election*

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention.

The species are as follows:

- 1) A single disclosed compound for Group I in the following claims 10-12 and 14
- 2) A single disclosed method for protecting plants and other materials with a specific compound for Group II in the claim 9.

- 3) A single disclosed process of preparation for a specific compound like a disclosed compound of formula (IA) or formula (I) in the following claims 13 and 15.

If applicant elects Group I, applicant is further required to elect a single disclosed compound for formula (I) or (IA) where all the substituents disclosed with the explanation and exact definition of all the substituents. Currently, claim 10 is generic to claims 10-12 and 14.

If applicant elects Group II, claim 9, applicant is further required to elect a single disclosed compound for formula I or IA for the method of protecting plants or materials.

If applicant elects Group III, applicant is further required to elect the process of preparation for a single disclosed compound for formula I or IA where all the substituents disclosed. Currently, claim 13 is generic to claims 13 and 15.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or

otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejections are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowances are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Chial*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

A telephone call to the attorney is not required where: 1) the restriction requirement is complex; 2) the application is being prosecuted pro se; or 3) the examiner knows from past experience that a telephone election will not be made (MPEP § 812.01). Therefore, since this restriction is required due to the amendments of the

claims in reply to the office action, a call to the attorney for telephone election was not made.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MANU M. MANOHAR whose telephone number is (571)270-5752. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu 9.00AM to 4.00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Padmanabhan Sreeni can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/589,113  
Art Unit: 1617

Page 8

MANU M. MANOHAR  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1617

MM

/YONG S. CHONG/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1617